

new Book

2-9-05

1961

see Peck,
on E and

The VCS/J-Staff/SAC
were insane.

and OSD/WH were
insane. (on lines)

(JFK - on VN? not so
much)

In 1963: a subtype of
insane (court)

insane (Din assass;
as in Brazil 64, ~~assass~~
Dan Rip, Chile 70-73 (+ before)
C-I, (C-II)

In 1964: OSD, VCS

The insane remaining is the insane

new book 2-10-05

What does the SIOB
(-62, -63 - or, all
its forms!)

tell us ^{me} about

Americans argue

our: USC

slavery humans

"trade

Indians our secret, our crisis

WWII SB (WWII;

Civil War)

(cont. of
Civil War?)

periods Good

(see Powers) Christianity

our present

our future

our foreign policy

As with:

Stalin

SU

Hitler

Nazis

aggression

holocaust

Bltz

Mao

Tojo, et al

Pal Pot

(+ US!)

genocides

politicized (+ US)

WWI + continuation

US-SU are never

Nausea:

= anti-Con hepatitis.

-

pure book
D-2/FS

2-17-05

Spain ~1988

the only hope of
US D-6 rents on
debt — the thin
real that the Dead
Hand might not be
turned on

Pro-stability: hard for
US to believe false
alarm (impossible
before 1960): and no
advantage for SU (ANA)

But if either (A)
believes that

1) D-L might occur,
and 2) other^B might
believe it might
occur

(as before above)
"perhaps"
then A might attack,
even if B does not
believe in D-L, and
A thinks it's unlikely!

SO's efforts for parody
can look like D-L!
do?

Shedden
book?

Does some how not
tend toward
stability as either
side, though one
claim (perhaps) to
be seeking it

("MAO" more affected
plans, targeting,
promotions, D-C air war
as it could be.

drop + ABM...

P-II

at least, a "not
wholly incredible
FS cap

(distinguish

hypothetical FS cap
(convertible threat)

esc FS threat
(to limit retal
to US FU or esc)

harder (if "no prov
of SU FS - SU would
have done well to check
D-L FS Threats: as SS-1/2

Mike Bove
2-18-05

Goal:

Op. CANDOOR + WB
on plans
effects
threats
arms control
+ NP loop
relation of "
to policy

FS/FD threats
(not abnormal under
McN - MAD

see East
2-18-05

C-X

and we set!

(Note our use of
local superiority
in Conclusions)

(= SO's in Turkey
or Berlin)

did not present

K from: defending

Cuba (= Berlin)

- posing FU threat

us. invasion (= Berlin)

- delegating/entrusting
(= Berlin)

AS IF K had not
use sub - as we did in Berlin!
(But he "had" (?) (NO) E back down

It was not
guaranteed —
not even likely —
that

1) K would bomb
down in Cuba
(without ^{public} ~~known~~ ^{knowledge})

he assumed that
his 100% (10) +
minutes in ~~the~~ Cuba
game in "parity"

(⁵⁰ ~~Rep.~~ is Europe vs.
^{US} ~~Rep.~~ is Center.)

— AND FOR JFK/MCN,
IT DID

JFK
(McN declined
to accede
US sup: as work
as VCS wanted:
USAF

or

(but see: accuracy ^{MIRV}
(in McN's eyes: for
2d strike O-L?
MIC intention?

New Book

Help Anticipate
on a real book,
for specialists -
opinions to of
thems

and give by
answers

to stimulate a
dialog
(like blog thread)

2-25-05

Rev Book

USG Highest Priority

Oil/Empire

Issue: - EU (from

FS (SU)

Berlin
(Euro)

- Israel (Terting
(neces))

- Allies w. dictators

- ⁿ w. drug dealers

Hence, actions against

or against (warning)

anti-prolif

anti-arms race

anti-drugs

anti-terror

anti-tyranny

new book

Dave Raymond

60,000

600,000,000

1 BB = Rogerski

10,000 BB's

STOP '62

~~from one~~

into

from one basket

into another

(Dave Raymond

Prime Time

2-7-05

2-7-05

Two books

Admit I did "accept
Type I Data

(but was misled)

²⁾ and did worry about
"backing down" in Berlin,
Cuba, even VN (CW)

(Against

(Querry?

(as I would have in
Hiroshima if I believed...)
just like water in the

support Army because

by belimed in WMO's
AQ / 9-11 / SHC